IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 8668 of 1989

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

S V R COLLEGE OF ENGINEER & TECHNOLOGY

Versus

S K AGRAWAL

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 8668 of 1989

MR SN SHELAT for Petitioner No. 1

MR RA MISHRA for Respondent No. 1

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

Date of decision: 14/02/2003

ORAL JUDGEMENT

The present petition is filed against the order passed by the Gujarat Affiliated Colleges Services

Tribunal at Ahmedabad in Application No.81/1985 whereby the petitioner college was directed to fix the applicant at the basic pay of Rs.1680/- under the Professor's scale with effect from June, 1980 and on that basis further directed to pay to the applicant any arrears of salaries and also pay the regular salaries as per the fixation.

2) At the time of hearing of this petition Mr.Magzaokar, learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has fixed the pay of respondent in the year 1993. As per the directions given by the Tribunal with effect from initial appointment of the petitioner, i.e. 20-6-1980 and the entire arrears were also paid by the petitioners to the respondent. The petitioner was paid regular salaries as per the said fixation. Since the difference in pay fixation is very insignificant that is the petitioner was initially paid Rs.1620 and thereafter as per the direction of the Tribunal his basic pay was fixed to Rs.1680/- and since the order of the Tribunal is complied with by the petitioenr way back in 1993, I do not find any justification to interfere with the order passed by the Tribunal. However, it is clarified that the Court has decided this matter only on the basis that the amount is very insignificant and has not gone into the merits of the matter. This decision should not, therefore, be treated as a precedent.

With these observations, the present petition is disposed of. Rule is discharged with no order as to costs.

(K.A.Puj, J.)
/malek